

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/654,087	Applicant(s) FUKUDA ET AL.	
	Examiner M. R. Sedighian	Art Unit 2633	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) M. R. Sedighian. (3)_____.

(2) Hung H. BUI. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 21 July 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: Independent claims 1,5,6 and 13.

Identification of prior art discussed: Nishikawa Toru, JP 11-295560; Shibamura US Pat. No. 4,803,689; Shimizu, USPat No. 5,960,142 and Driessen EP-0501571 (as cited in IDS filed on May 12, 2004).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants discussed patentability of claims 1, 5, 6 and 13 relative to Toru '560, Shibamura '689 and Shimizu '142, and the Examiner agreed that these claims, as amended as per Amendment filed on March 31, 2004 are distinguishable over these references. However, the Examiner found Driessen '571 (as cited in IDS filed on May 12, 2004) appears to read on amended claims 1, 5, 6 and 13 (or at least render these claims unpatentable). The Examiner advised a closer examination of FIG. 3 of Driessen '571, particularly the optical isolator disposed on the protrusion (sideface) of the package. A new Office Action will be forthcoming with new rejections based on Driessen '571 .